

REMARKS

I. Introduction

In response to the Office Action dated September 22, 2004, claims 1, 3-11, 13-14, 16-27, 29-37 and 39 have been amended. Claims 1-39 remain in the application. Re-examination and re-consideration of the application, as amended, is requested.

II. Claim Amendments

Applicants' attorney has made amendments to the claims as indicated above. These amendments were made solely for the purpose of clarifying the language of the claims, and were not required for patentability or to distinguish the claims over the prior art.

III. Prior Art Rejections

In paragraphs (3)-(4) of the Office Action, claims 1-39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Plantz et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,088,702 (Plantz) in view of Doherty, "Project-Specific Web Sites," Interiors, March 1998, Vol. 157, Iss. 3 (Doherty).

Applicants' attorney respectfully traverses these rejections.

The Office Action asserts that Plantz teaches most of the limitations of Applicants' independent claims. However, the Office Action admits that Plantz fails to explicitly disclose architectural project information, which includes drawings, documents, communications, and tasks related to the architectural projects. Nonetheless, the Office Action asserts that Doherty teaches a means for accessing architectural project information using an interactive web site hosted on a server. Thus, the Office Action asserts that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Plantz and Doherty before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the collaborative environment methods taught by Plantz to include the architectural information of Doherty, because it would have extended the project information control of multiple users in the implementation of an interactive collaborative web site.

Applicants' attorney disagrees. The cited references, individually or in combination, do not teach nor suggest all of the various elements of Applicants' independent claims.

Plantz merely describes a web-based Group Publishing System (GPS) for permitting coordinated publishing, assembly and administration of texts. However, nowhere does Plantz describe an application programming interface (API) as recited in Applicants' claims. Indeed, Plantz envisions no need for an API, because the GPS is accessed using a browser, "without requiring

software changes to the user's software," as described at col. 7, lines 22-27. In Applicants' claims, on the other hand, the API provides a plurality of simplified procedures that allow an application program executed by the client computer to access architectural project information stored across the internet on a server site. Moreover, as admitted by the Office Action, Plantz does not disclose accessing architectural project information

Similarly, Doherty merely describes the use of project-specific web sites for interior design firms. However, nowhere does Doherty describe an application programming interface (API) that provides a plurality of simplified procedures that allow an application program executed by the client computer to access architectural project information stored across the internet on a server site. Indeed, Doherty, like Plantz, envisions no need for an API, because the project-specific web sites would be accessed using a standard browser.

In addition, the Office Action uses hindsight when combining Plantz and Doherty, and fails to establish a prima facie case of obviousness. Specifically, there is no suggestion anywhere in Doherty that the text publishing system of Plantz could be applied to architectural projects. There must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the reference themselves, or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify and combine the references in the manner suggested by the Office Action. However, there is no such suggestion or motivation implicitly or explicitly in Doherty or Plantz. Instead, any suggestion to modify Plantz for use by Doherty is made only by the Office Action itself.

Thus, Applicants submit that independent claims 1, 14, and 27 are allowable over Plantz and Doherty. Further, dependent claims 2-13, 15-26, and 28-39 are submitted to be allowable over Plantz and Doherty in the same manner, because they are dependent on independent claims 1, 14, and 27, respectively, and thus contain all the limitations of the independent claims. In addition, dependent claims 2-13, 15-26, and 28-39 recite additional novel elements not shown by Plantz and Doherty.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the above, it is submitted that this application is now in good order for allowance and such allowance is respectfully solicited.

Should the Examiner believe minor matters still remain that can be resolved in a telephone interview, the Examiner is urged to call Applicants' undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

GATES & COOPER LLP
Attorneys for Applicants

Howard Hughes Center
6701 Center Drive West, Suite 1050
Los Angeles, California 90045
(310) 641-8797

Date: December 20, 2004

By: _____
Name: George H. Gates
Reg. No.: 39,187

GHG/amb